



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/134,451	08/14/98	GRAFF R	GRAFF-P1-98

PETER K TRZYNA
P O BOX 7131
CHICAGO IL 60680-7131

LM71/1025

EXAMINER

ROSEN, N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2764

4

DATE MAILED: 10/25/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/134,451

Applicant(s)
Graff

Examiner
Nicholas D. Rosen

Group Art Unit
2764



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas D. Rosen

(3) _____

(2) Peter Trzyna

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 22, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Trzyna called to ask whether a Terminal Disclaimer was in fact necessary, since the term of a patent issued on the instant application would in any case not extend beyond the term of Patent 5,802,501. Examiner Rosen said that he thought it was, but would check. Mr. Trzyna also asked whether it would be necessary to make all of the specifications double spaced (Examiner Rosen had not objected to the inclusion of single spaced documents as appendices).

Examiner Rosen consulted a SPRE, and called back, leaving a message on Mr. Trzyna's voicemail. Examiner Rosen confirmed that a Terminal Disclaimer was required (or the double patenting rejection could be traversed, but in any case the issue could not be ignored). Also, all of the specification should be double-spaced.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

James P. Frambrell
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2700

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.